

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1 and 2 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is independent. The claims have been amended to correct minor typographical errors, and to format claim 1 for easier readability.

In accordance with MPEP 714.16, the following remarks are provided to comply with the requirements that the applicant show:

- (A) why the amendment is needed;
- (B) why the proposed amended or new claims require no additional search or examination;
- (C) why the claims are patentable; and
- (D) why they were not presented earlier.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claims is needed to correct a translation error which substituted the word “supersonic” instead of --ultrasonic--, and to use consistent terminology throughout the claims. The title, specification and Abstract discuss an ultrasonic method for cleaning clothes, not a supersonic method. For consistency and accuracy, the amendment is needed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment would not require further search or examination since the disclosure clearly discussed the ultrasonic method of cleaning clothes and since the search should have involved the same class/subclasses.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims remain allowable substantially for the reasons set forth in the Examiner's Reasons for Allowance, with the caution that the present invention relates to an ultrasonic method of washing clothes, rather than a supersonic method.

Finally, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment was not presented earlier because the Notice of Allowance was the first Office Action received in this application.


It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims have not introduced any "new matter" into the application. Support for the ultrasonic method can be found at least on pages 3, 5-6, 9-10 and 12-15 of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that rephrasing of a passage does not constitute new matter. Accordingly, a rewording of a passage where the same meaning remains intact is permissible. *In re Anderson*, 471 F.2d 1237, 176 USPQ 331 (CCPA 1973). An amendment to correct an obvious error does not constitute new matter where one skilled in the art would not only recognize the existence of error in the specification, but also the appropriate correction. *In re Odd*, 443 F.2d 1200, 170 USPQ 268 (CCPA 1971).

### **Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the above amendments are fully supported by the original specification. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced into the application by the above amendments.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


  
/ \_\_\_\_\_ /

Customer No. 21828  
Carrier, Blackman & Associates, P.C.  
24101 Novi Road, Suite 100  
Novi, Michigan 48375  
21 October 2008

William Blackman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,397  
(248) 344-4422

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted, via EFS web, to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on 21 October 2008.

  
/ \_\_\_\_\_ /